

COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT

April 02, 2013

5:15 p.m.

Chairman Roy called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen Roy, Shea, Craig, Greazzo, Gamache

Messrs: K. Sheppard, P. Capano, T. Soucy, W. Anderson, T. Brennan,
K. DeFrancis, K. O'Maley, B. Flagler, L. LaFreniere

Chairman Roy addressed item 3 of the agenda:

3. [Ratify and confirm phone poll conducted on March 8, 2013, authorizing the Fire Chief to use any available balances from the Hackett Hill Fire Station Project towards the Central Fire Station Generator Project to cover a shortfall in funding.](#)
[\(Unanimous vote with the exception of Alderman Gamache who could not be reached\)](#)

*On motion of **Alderman Gamache**, duly seconded by **Alderman Greazzo**, it was voted to ratify and confirm the phone poll.*

Chairman Roy addressed item 4 of the agenda:

4. [Summary of sewer abatement requests submitted by Fred McNeill, Chief Engineer.](#)
(Note: Applications and backup documentation are attached.)

*On motion of **Alderman Craig**, duly seconded by **Alderman Gamache**, it was voted to approve this item with **Alderman Greazzo** voting in opposition.*

Chairman Roy addressed item 5 of the agenda:

5. [Communication from Fred McNeill, Chief Engineer, requesting approval of the revised sewer abatement policy.](#)

***Alderman Craig** moved to approve this item. **Alderman Shea** duly seconded the motion.*

Alderman Greazzo stated could we have Mr. McNeill come up to give us some explanation of what's different in this policy or Mr. Sheppard?

Mr. Kevin Sheppard, Public Works Director, stated I know Fred is on his way but I'm hoping I can answer any questions you may have.

Alderman Greazzo asked can you just give us a quick summation of what's different in this policy from the previous policy? What changes were made?

Mr. Sheppard replied sure. There are two things. One thing that came to light is you can see item seven that is added. There is a state RSA which places a statute of limitations for reimbursement requests, so we've added that into this. And the second one, item eight, which is on the revised; our thought was if someone installs a deduct meter, they are going to see a reduction in their sewer bills. So the intent of the abatement process is not to give people that, I don't want to call it a loophole, but a chance to come in for an abatement because they've seen a large reduction in their sewer usage fee.

Alderman Greazzo stated thank you, and thank you Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Roy called for a vote on the motion. *There being none opposed, the motion carried.*

Chairman Roy addressed item 6 of the agenda:

6. [Communication from Leon LaFreniere, Director of Planning & Community Development, requesting substitution of SRF funds with EPD cash for various EPD projects.](#)

On motion of Alderman Shea, duly seconded by Alderman Craig, it was voted to approve this item.

Chairman Roy addressed item 7 of the agenda:

7. [Request from the Parks, Recreation & Cemetery Division for acceptance of a donation from The Webster House for CIP project 510912 Livingston Park Additions.](#)

Alderman Craig moved to approve this item. Alderman Greazzo duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Craig stated I am just curious about the timing of the fountain.

Mr. Peter Capano, Parks, Recreation and Cemetery Director, replied we have been requested to get that fountain in as soon as possible, as you can imagine, by Don Kennedy, and that is our intent. We're obviously waiting for ice-out, but we expect it to be fully in operation by the end of April.

Alderman Craig asked and the restrooms are open to the public now?

Mr. Capano replied yes, they are. From 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m.

Alderman Craig stated great, thank you very much.

Chairman Roy called for a vote on the motion to approve this item. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Roy addressed item 8 of the agenda:

8. [Communication from Timothy Soucy, Public Health Director, requesting approval of the agreement allowing Elliot Hospital to receive portable ventilators and associated equipment.](#)

On motion of Alderman Shea, duly seconded by Alderman Gamache, it was voted to approve this item.

Chairman Roy addressed item 9 of the agenda:

9. [Amending Resolution and budget authorization providing for acceptance and expenditure of \\$40,000 from DHHS for CIP project 211913 School Based Dental Services.](#)

On motion of Alderman Shea, duly seconded by Alderman Craig, it was voted to approve this item.

Chairman Roy addressed item 10 of the agenda:

10. [Request from the Health Department to accept grant funds in the amount of \\$47,896 from NH Department of Health and Human Services for school-based oral health services.](#)

Alderman Craig moved to approve this item. Alderman Shea duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Greazzo stated thank you, Mr. Chairman. It seems like these are identical programs. Could you explain the difference between the two?

Mr. Timothy Soucy, Public Health Director, replied sure. Item nine is Medicaid reimbursement. So when we provide services that are Medicaid eligible, we bill Medicaid and we use that to offset the cost of our dental assistant and maintenance on our dental van. Item ten is a grant we get every year from the state health department, it is federal block grant dollars that come through the state. Actually the good news is we used to get \$20,000 a year, we've been able to get a little bit more, about \$24,000 a year for the next two years.

Alderman Greazzo asked and the services that each program provides is what?

Mr. Soucy replied it's all part of our school-based services. We provide dental services to eligible children at all of the elementary schools, the middle schools and we'll be beginning a pilot at West High School this year.

Alderman Greazzo stated thank you, and thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Roy asked Tim, item ten is time sensitive?

Mr. Soucy replied yes, item ten is time sensitive. If we could get that reported out this evening... The state wants that contract back as soon as possible to get it to the governor and council.

Chairman Roy called for a vote on the motion to approve this item. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Roy stated if the clerk could report that out tonight.

Ms. Heather Freeman, Assistant City Clerk, responded we will.

Chairman Roy addressed item 11 of the agenda:

11. [Communication from Wesley Anderson, Central Fleet Services Director, submitting proposed changes to the City's MER program.](#)

On motion of Alderman Shea, duly seconded by Alderman Greazzo, it was voted to discuss this item.

Mr. Wesley Anderson, Central Fleet Services Director, stated basically this is just an update to the motorized equipment policy. It is really focused on the creation of the central fleet. The intent is to create a document that is a flexible policy that provides staff with the ability to make changes to the annual purchasing plan based on condition of existing vehicles. The proposed policy retains the elements of the existing policy that this committee has for approving additions to the fleet. The policy also allows staff to replace individual vehicles that were taken out of service that are uneconomical to repair. The agenda item includes both the proposed and existing policies, though the proposed changes and the additions to the existing policy are underlined in the proposed policy. The proposed policy

does leave those items that deal with use and storage of city vehicles unchanged. Basically the changes fall under five categories. One is a simple replacement of central fleet into the policy replacing Public Works. The other puts Central Fleet in with some of the duties shared between Public Works and Central Fleet, such as the requirement that a vehicle that's going to be retained after being replaced goes through Central Fleet before coming to this committee. The last few really deal with adjustments to account for the creation of the motorized equipment replacement program, the funding that you approve every year for it, and then formalization of the process to use funds from the sale of MER funded vehicles to purchase vehicles that I had to take out of service, based off from their condition. Then the last piece is the procurement approval process, and that's probably where I'll spend the most time on. What I've really done is the procurement approval process has been broken up into two areas, which are the long-range and the short-range. The long-range is basically just a conceptual ten-year replacement plan that provides me the information and the departments the information of what we need to program and allocate for the ten-year MER. The short-range really converts that long-range plan into an annual replacement program. The committee and the Board of Mayor and Aldermen, of course, approves the annual allocation of the budget process, we'll still finalize the annual replacement program and what we'll do after that portion is done, we'll start making all of our adjustments and provide you with an information brief of what we're actually purchasing, not by vehicle number, but by type so that you know what the replacement plan is for the year. Of course that plan may change depending upon the condition of any vehicle if we have a major breakdown and it becomes too uneconomical to repair. Subject to your questions, that concludes my presentation.

Alderman Craig stated thank you. This is very informative. My main question focuses on the information that you provided back to us when we asked questions regarding this year's budget. You had indicated that there are some ways that we

could potentially reduce costs over the long term by doing things such as utilizing vehicles with less fuel or alternate fuel and retaining vehicles for a shorter periods of time and other examples like that. Have you built these items into this process?

Mr. Anderson replied we're actually starting right now with the replacement plan that we have scheduled for fiscal year 2014. Several of the trucks that we're looking at buying, what we're starting to talk with the manufacturers in regards to what their warranty programs are. With these very high technological computer driven vehicles, if you hold them too long then your replacement costs become astronomical when you have to start pulling computer parts out of it. Typically we're looking at warranties within the five to seven year range for the engines and the components and the transmission, which will help lower our costs. Long-term we need to start looking at changing from a diesel based fleet to those more compressed natural gas type fleet. Part of the problem with that conversion is the lead cost of creating a or constructing a refueling station. There are now partnerships that are starting to be developed in the state of New Hampshire for compressed natural and liquified natural gas stations, and part of our process I'll be doing over the next year is working with these possible partners to see what we can do about getting a station within the Manchester area which makes it economical for us to fuel off of, and then we would just begin the process converting the fleet as we replace vehicles out.

Alderman Craig asked so the short answer is yes?

Mr. Anderson replied yes, but it's going to be a long process because we'll only be doing it as we purchase new vehicles.

Alderman Craig stated okay, but when you do, you will be taking these items into consideration from this process.

Mr. Anderson replied yes.

Alderman Craig stated thank you.

*On motion of **Alderman Shea**, duly seconded by **Alderman Gamache**, it was voted to approve this item.*

Chairman Roy addressed item 12 of the agenda:

12. [Communication from Wesley Anderson, Central Fleet Services Director, requesting an amendment of the existing CIP account set up for the FY2013 MER to accept revenue from the sale of City vehicles and allow for acquisition expenses.](#)

***Alderman Greazzo** moved to approve this item. **Alderman Craig** duly seconded the motion.*

Alderman Greazzo stated thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Anderson, how do you plan on selling these vehicles? At the state auction or on your own?

Mr. Anderson replied actually what we're doing is we're using a website called govdeals and it meets all of the requirements that are in the City ordinance for how we dispose of this. So from the time we get it out of service and we're able to pull everything off that we don't want to sell, we can usually get it up on that website within a week to two weeks. And then depending upon what we think we're going to get for it is how long we'll leave it up on the website.

Alderman Greazzo asked what is your fallback if it doesn't sell on that website?

Mr. Anderson replied we have not had a vehicle that has not sold on that website. Even ones that are just junk we have been able to sell for parts.

Alderman Greazzo stated thank you, Mr. Chairman.

***Chairman Roy** called for a vote on the motion to approve this item. There being none opposed, the motion carried.*

Chairman Roy addressed item 13 of the agenda:

13. [Resolutions and budget authorization providing for acceptance and expenditure of \\$2.8 million bond for City schools technology upgrades.](#)
(Note: Referred by the Board of Mayor and Aldermen on 3/19/2013)

*On motion of **Alderman Shea**, duly seconded by **Alderman Greazzo**, it was voted to discuss this item.*

Chairman Roy stated thank you for coming.

Dr. Thomas Brennan, Manchester School Superintendent, stated good evening.

Alderman Shea stated there's been a discussion among the members here concerning exactly what your judgment is on this. Does it meet with your approval, do you know how this would implemented, certain questions? Could you kind of respond as best you can.

Dr. Brennan replied yes, sir, I'd be happy to do that for you. I'm 100% behind this approach mainly because if we wait for the normal procedure around budgeting, we'll never get to the point where we have to get specifically in the area of network and developing the infrastructure. We don't have the capacity now. Even if we were to go out and spend all of the money on new computers or be given new computers, we do not have the infrastructure in place that would allow for our staff and students to take advantage of the new technologies that are out there. The other component is the fact that, as I've said, I believe, in earlier comments, that we're looking to spread the purchase of hardware over a period of time as opposed to going out and getting it right away because we need to do the third component, which is training for our staff. We are woefully behind in preparing our staff to not only access for their own needs but also to allow students to be able to interact during instructional time with the equipment. So first it is the foundation, which is the infrastructure, expanding the capacity of that infrastructure by ten-fold so that we would not only be able to have a rapid response within our network system, but would allow us for future purchases that we're talking about as the other components. That is a long answer but that is what I believe.

Alderman Shea asked is this the most judicious way to use this funding money or can it be used for any other purposes other than this, in your opinion? I know you're not a legal person.

Dr. Brennan replied yes, I do, because as I stated right from the beginning, it's going to be very difficult to lay down that foundation that's sort of worth the upfront money to develop the infrastructure, to expand the speed of the computers, and yes, I do believe, because it's probably the only bondable thing that we could come up with right now. I'd love to be able to use those kinds of dollars for staffing and such.

Alderman Shea stated that's what my question was of you.

Dr. Brennan added but we can't do that. My understanding of the bonding process prohibits us from doing that sort of thing, even though our life span is a little bit longer than a computer, we just can't do it.

Alderman Shea asked does this meet the approval of the members of the school committee?

Dr. Brennan replied yes, sir. They have taken action on the \$2.8 million. We haven't developed a plan, we still need to go forward, that's why it was brought to your attention, so I believe that's what we need to do next.

Alderman Shea stated thank you very much.

Chairman Roy asked so you're saying that it needs to come to us before a plan is developed?

Dr. Brennan replied we have the plan, sir, but we have to share it with the board to get them to sign off on the plan.

Chairman Roy stated okay, so the School Board has to sign off on the plan.

Dr. Brennan replied yes, sir.

Chairman Roy stated I notice on page 13.1 it says that the program initiation is April 2nd. By reading that I'm guessing this is time sensitive.

Dr. Brennan replied yes, air. It's very time sensitive.

Chairman Roy asked how quickly can you get that information back to us from your board?

Dr. Brennan replied we meet Monday night. So if we get a sense from here, we can get that back to you. But I'm a little confused as to what we can do or what you can do. So if that's what you need, we'll get it back because we can't present it to you unless we've done it to our board.

Chairman Roy stated we'd certainly need it at the full board before they do anything with it.

Dr. Brennan responded okay.

Alderman Craig stated thank you, Mr. Chairman. Dr. Brennan, when you came before us a few weeks ago, you had mentioned that there was a plan and then you would get that to us and we have not received that yet.

Dr. Brennan responded I have it.

Alderman Craig stated I don't feel comfortable approving this unless I've seen the plan and how it would be implemented. I do have some concerns based on when you sat before us about a month ago, one of which was you had mentioned it would take two to three years to implement, and what I don't want to happen is to approve this bonding and for the School District to purchase the bulk. This is broken into four components. One is increasing bandwidth, which is \$500,000, then there is \$500,000 geared toward security. But the bulk of it, \$1.5 million, is geared toward buying devices and laptops for students. And what I don't want to

happen is for the district to go out and purchase these items and have them sit and then when we can use them, they won't be useful. I personally have not seen a plan. You said to us when you were here that you don't have the staff currently to implement this, that it would take two to three years, and I haven't heard anything in terms of planning for students. I've talked to someone who went through this process in Nashua and found that at the elementary school level kids just froze when they had a computer put in front of them and that not only do teachers need to be trained but children need to be trained. So I feel like there are a lot of moving parts here and I don't feel comfortable approving this at this point in time for those reasons. Those are my comments.

Dr. Brennan asked may I speak to that?

Chairman Roy replied please do.

Dr. Brennan stated thank you, air. What I said in terms of the reason I was saying it would take probably two years for the equipment purchase is so we could avoid just what you talked about. The most important component of this right now would be the expansion of our infrastructure, the development of greater bandwidth, and then providing training for our staff so they would be prepared to work with our students. The very last component would be the sharing of the hardware with students.

Alderman Craig stated so then I question why we would need to bond the full amount then. Why wouldn't we be able to just move forward with doing what your immediate needs are after we see the plan, and then when you pilot bring-your-own-device at the high school level and we see what the needs are, then we can go out and purchase what your needs are from a School District perspective.

Dr. Brennan asked are you suggesting that we perhaps look at phasing in this bond so that we would take care of our infrastructure and our bandwidth and the training before we go out and purchase the computers?

Alderman Craig stated I would suggest that.

Dr. Brennan stated and I can't give you an answer why it all has to be done to get the \$2.8 million. I believe that the overall scope of the plan would allow for that. In fact, that's why I kept wanting to bring up the fact that we're not going to do it like we did the book loan where we seemed to have it done within a year and we needed time to lie that out. I would agree that the last thing you need to purchase would be the student component because we won't have our teachers trained and comfortable with the process. I'm not clear on the financials in terms of if we can do a lower amount, what would that be. Again, I'm just reacting to what the mayor put in the budget and that I thought it was an appropriate thing to do and Alderman Shea asked me that question. I don't know if we could do it in another way where we would ensure... What I don't want to lose is everything because of one piece. In other words, without that infrastructure to begin with, without the increased bandwidth, that connectivity that we need and the training we need, it doesn't matter how many computers we get.

Alderman Craig asked is security in here somewhere?

Dr. Brennan replied yes, it is.

Alderman Craig asked where is that built in?

Dr. Brennan replied that would be in the beginning part because of our telephonic problems that we have, as well as our intercom systems.

Alderman Craig stated I would moved to table this item until the committee sees the plan and we have a reaction regarding phasing in this money and whether or not we need to bond the full amount.

Alderman Craig moved to table this item until a plan for implementation is developed by the School District. The motion was duly seconded by Alderman Greazzo.

Alderman Shea stated I think Dr. Brennan wants to respond.

Dr. Brennan stated I'd just would like to know if it is tabled, when is your next meeting. One of the things I struggle with is the process in terms of catching up if you miss one cycle. How long do you have to wait for the next cycle.

Chairman Roy responded our next meeting would be the first Monday of next month, and that's a concern to me too. That is why I thought we could put this to the full board.

Alderman Craig stated we could have a special meeting, correct.

Chairman Roy stated and then we could table it at the full board and get all of this information.

Dr. Brennan stated that would be helpful.

Alderman Shea stated my question is, and again it is more financial, let's assume where she was going that it is \$2.8 million but the plan hasn't been finalized. But let's assume that there was some revision in the plan so that the entire amount

would not be needed initially, and again, this is financial. But wouldn't it be more judicious to have the full amount and spend the amount as one sees the need to spend it rather than not have that money? We do bond certain things like when we bonded the civic center we didn't pay the full amount that we owed. The first year we seemed to carry it over to a few years and other projects like that. I guess I'm in favor of it is a bird in the hand is worth two in the bush, so to speak, in a sense you get the full amount but then as you develop the plan in terms of how would be the best way to approach the spending in terms of the implementation, you do have that amount available to use, and I'm not sure whether that's held with your financial department at the School District.

Dr. Brennan stated I'd like to ask Ms. DeFrancis to come forward please.

Alderman Shea stated I guess the question is, should we table the issue now or should we send it on to the full board and have it tabled then. And then as discussion concerning how the funding would be implemented, would the full amount obviously be spent at once or is it more judicious to have certain phases of the plan implemented and spending it as the need is seen for that spending.

Ms. Karen DeFrancis, Manchester School District Business Administrator, responded the way I understood it was that the bonding obviously would be done by the City, the entire \$2.8 million, and then we potentially would spend that over two years depending on the phase-in of the infrastructure and then the computers and the professional development as well. So it would be up to the City finance officer when the best time to go out to bond would be. We did not put anything into the fiscal year 2014 budget for a bond payment, so we would anticipate the first bond payment being in fiscal year 2015.

Alderman Shea asked would that agree with what you're thinking that the bonding person's thoughts you have expressed?

Ms. DeFrancis responded again, I think it would be up to the finance director as to when the best time to go to market for that bond is.

Alderman Shea asked but it would be better to have the full amount, the \$2.8 million, in your opinion?

Ms. DeFrancis replied I believe it would be because the entire project is a \$2.8 million project and then we would just phase it in depending on how much the infrastructure, how much it would be for professional development after that, and then the balance on the computers.

Chairman Roy stated when we say we're going to bond something, it doesn't mean we're going to run out tomorrow to float the bond. We wait and we pick our spots, but the finance officer does that.

Alderman Shea stated thank you.

Alderman Craig stated with all due respect, I haven't seen the plan and this is a lot of money. So from a committee perspective, and my understanding how the committee perspective works, we don't just approve something and then table it at the full board. We vet it out at the committee level and we if we agree with it, we vote in favor of it. Until I see the IT plan and I see the timeline on how you're going to use this money, it doesn't sit well with me. Thank you.

Dr. Brennan asked may I just have a quick conversation here? I don't want to be rude.

Chairman Roy replied please do.

Dr. Brennan stated I will distribute the plan that we have because I think it is that critical and deal with what the consequences may be with our IT and our board. They've approved the general concept, they believe, as I outlined earlier, the networking, the infrastructure, the development of the bandwidth, the use of training monies, as well as the actual hardware purchasing, and the telephonic and intercom process. I can give that to you, but I don't know if you'd have time to look at it tonight and make that action, so I don't know whether you would be willing to do that. I made copies, but then when I came here I remembered that we hadn't really floated the detail of it to the board, and that becomes problematic for us as we go through this trying to match up timelines. I don't know whatever your committee's pleasure is, but all I know is that we need it and we're not going to go helter skelter in terms of expending those dollars. In fact, if I had my way, I'd probably stretch the actual purchasing total use of those dollars into the third or forth year and not only would you phase in the use, you may identify islands of comfort level within the district so you could pilot in different levels instead of just going out and purchasing it. And as we all know, the cost varies dramatically over a period of time and they become commodities.

Chairman Roy called for a vote on the motion to table this item. With Alderman Shea and Chairman Roy voting in opposition, the motion carried.

Dr. Brennan stated sir, may I just ask for the timeline.

Chairman Roy responded Dr. Brennan, you said you're going to bring that plan to your board Monday.

Dr. Brennan replied yes, sir.

Chairman Roy asked can you get it to us the next day?

Dr. Brennan replied yes, sir.

Chairman Roy stated if it is important enough, I can call a special meeting the following week, I think. I'll have to talk to the clerk when we can fit it in.

Dr. Brennan stated I appreciate that, and I think it is important enough.

Chairman Roy stated we can handle it that way without waiting a whole month.

Dr. Brennan responded that would be terrific. I'd appreciate that effort. Thank you.

Chairman Roy addressed item 14 of the agenda:

14. [Resolutions and budget authorization providing for acceptance and expenditure of \\$3.2 million for Phase II Energy and Deferred Maintenance Program.](#)
(Note: Referred by the Board of Mayor and Aldermen on 3/19/2013)

Ms. Freeman stated I believe the corrected amount is \$3 million. There were revised resolutions and a budget authorization that went out to the committee.

On motion of Alderman Shea, duly seconded by Alderman Craig, it was voted to discuss this item.

Alderman Shea asked Mr. O'Maley, could you give a little background here? It is quite a substantial amount of \$3 million.

Mr. Kevin O'Maley, Chief Facilities Manager, replied sure. I think as many of you are aware, we had a phase I energy program that was incredibly successful. We've actually taken over a million dollars of utility costs out of the School District's budget through commodity expenses and contracts, as well as energy conservation projects. As we encountered that, we got most of the projects that were in the payback range of three, four and five years, and after we took a look at that, there were still a number of projects that we had paybacks anywhere from the 6 to 20-year range that we did not consider in the first phase. In that first phase we probably spent about \$2.5 million on the School District. So we worked with the school administration and the building and sites committee to come up with a plan to say how can we take care of some of the deferred maintenance projects which would be like boilers and envelope insulation as well as windows that have a longer term payback and get that to basically have the bond payments offset by energy conservation savings. We presented a cash flow analysis to the School Board, as well as the buildings and sites committee. So this \$3 million in essence is no net cost to the City and a big component of that was, again, we worked with Dr. Brennan, I think it was at the end of 2010, we're getting building aid on these projects because building aid, I think, as many of you people are aware, there is a moratorium on that but we had that approved up in Concord at that point in time, and over the course of the last few months Dr. Brennan did verify that we will get building aid on these things as well. So that is a little bit of the background.

Alderman Shea asked where do you see the greatest return? At the high schools, middle schools, the elementary schools or at all levels in terms of this particular bonding?

Mr. O'Maley replied based on where we're at it is pretty much all over the map. One of the things we look at is the unit cost per square foot in each one of the schools, and we have some that are as low as 39 KBDs per square foot and we have some that are up in the 65 range. So the ones that are up in the 65 KBDs per square foot that's where we're going to focus a lot of our energy. But at the same time we have some schools where we replaced boilers recently and we have some that the age of the boilers are probably in excess of 25 years. So those will also be candidates. The only thing we're going to do is blend all this together to make sure that we offset the bond payment.

Alderman Shea asked do you find that the expenditures are more for schools that are new or schools that are older? In other words, is there more expenditures or are the older type schools a little bit better constructed and therefore you don't necessarily spend as much maintenance costs on them? Just a thought.

Mr. O'Maley replied that's a great question. It is one where it was a learning curve that we had over the course of this. Our oldest schools like Bakersville and the ones at Central are the most efficient. They have walls that are 3.5 to 4 feet thick which contributes to all of that, but one of the things that we did with the EPA is had those energy star rated. It is on a scale of 1 – 100. Central comes in at a 98, Bakersville is like at a 92 and our new schools like McLaughlin are probably in the 55 range. So I hope that answers your question, but it was kind of an interesting analysis that we looked at.

Alderman Shea stated I know that Hallsville is an older school, much older than you and I combined ages, and it is still probably very serviceable in terms of its utilitarian use, in terms of its ability to provide back. Thank you for that response.

Chairman Roy asked Mr. O'Maley, is this time sensitive because I've been asked to report it out tonight?

Mr. O'Maley replied not really. I don't think it needs to get reported out tonight but we'd like to move it along.

Alderman Shea moved to approve this item. Alderman Gamache duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Greazzo stated Mr. O'Maley, you said you saved a million dollars through the first round, roughly.

Mr. O'Maley stated what that is is savings compared to a baseline of 2008. So they are actual utility expenses that are over a million dollars less compared to 2008. I think when you compare last year to the previous year, it was about a half million dollars.

Alderman Greazzo asked why aren't you then in turn using those savings to fund the next phase rather than borrowing more money?

Mr. O'Maley replied that wasn't the way we structured the plan. That wasn't anything we talked about.

Alderman Greazzo stated thank you.

Chairman Roy called for a vote on the motion. With Alderman Greazzo voting in opposition, the motion carried.

Chairman Roy asked Mr. O'Maley, before you leave, do you have a plan for that one, exactly what you're going to do with that money?

Mr. O'Maley asked what the projects are?

Chairman Roy replied yes.

Mr. O'Maley stated we have kind of a conceptual plan. It is a chicken and the egg thing with these things because in order to pay an engineer to go out and give us a real hard analysis of all of these things, we'd have to expend some money to do that. But with the contractor we had on board we have some of what I would call rule-of-thumb estimates that were conservative; they're the same estimates we used in the initial phase of this, and we exceeded all of those estimates on every one of the projects.

Chairman Roy asked can you get that to us as soon as possible?

Mr. O'Maley replied sure.

Alderman Greazzo stated point of order, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to point out that we tabled the last one because we didn't have a plan, so I'm kind of surprised that this passed without having a plan. I'd like to see that in hand but it's obviously too late to table it now. Thank you.

Chairman Roy addressed item 15 of the agenda:

15. [Resolutions and budget authorizations providing for a transfer of the remaining bond balance from the McGregor Street Project to a new CIP project for school grounds rehab.](#)

*On motion of **Alderman Greazzo**, duly seconded by **Alderman Shea**, it was voted to approve this item.*

Chairman Roy addressed item 16 of the agenda:

16. [Communication from Leon LaFreniere, Director of Planning & Community Development, requesting acceptance of \\$35,000 from the NH Department of Justice for CIP project 411713 Domestic Violence Prosecutor.](#)

*On motion of **Alderman Shea**, duly seconded by **Alderman Greazzo**, it was voted to approve this item.*

Chairman Roy stated could you please report that one out tonight. That is time sensitive.

Ms. Freeman responded we will.

Chairman Roy addressed item 17 of the agenda:

17. [Communication from Beth Flagler, Program Administrator NH Rivers Council, regarding dam removals and restoration.](#)

*On motion of **Alderman Greazzo**, duly seconded by **Alderman Shea**, it was voted to discuss this item.*

Alderman Greazzo stated Mr. Chairman, Mr. Sheppard and Ms. Flagler will give a brief synopsis and then we can discuss the project.

Ms. Beth Flagler, New Hampshire Rivers Council Program Administrator, stated thank you for having me here today. The New Hampshire Rivers Council is seeking the inkind support from the City of Manchester for inkind equipment and services to be provided for the proposed dam removals over on McQuesten Brook, the watershed there. I think you've had a chance hopefully to look over the PowerPoint presentation that was provided, and I'd be happy to answer any questions.

Chairman Roy asked do you have anything to add, Mr. Sheppard?

Mr. Sheppard replied no. We've met with the New Hampshire Rivers Council several times. I've also asked Beth to be fairly quick tonight, and that's why she's not going through the complete presentation. We support this. We think it's a great project and we've met with Alderman Greazzo. I never realized there are three decrepit or in disrepair dams over there in the McQuesten Brook area, and the New Hampshire Rivers Council has done a lot of work. They've brought volunteers into the area to do a lot of clean up. I didn't realize there was brook trout, I believe it is, over there, and it amazes me what a nice area it is once I actually got over there to see it. We support this. As she mentioned, they're looking for inkind services. We estimated that, they went for a grant, they were able to obtain a grant, but the grant is not final. The current rules are that we need to bring it to the board before we can formalize any grants. We figured out inkind services somewhere around \$24,000 and that's an inflated number, and that includes equipment cost, material cost and some of our labor cost. So when you throw that in there, the City's inkind match to this would be about \$24,000 for the

grant, and a lot of that work is jackhammer operators to break up the dams because we can't get an excavator in there.

Ms. Flagler stated I'd like to point out that by removing these dam structures, they're really just granite blocks, I think you can see in the pictures there. They are obsolete and in disrepair. The stream channel would be reconnected of approximately 1,500 feet and that would allow for the brook trout to migrate more up into where the McQuesten Pond had been previously impounded. That pond is only about 18 inches deep on average and it does heat up and have blooms, it is an impaired water body, so it would be a much healthier ecosystem if it were back to its original stream condition.

Chairman Roy asked so you're looking for us to give you permission tonight to do the inkind services? Is that what you're looking for?

Mr. Sheppard replied correct. If you notice though, the inkind services, if you looked at the schedule, I don't believe is until later in 2014, so it would actually be in fiscal year 2015. But to keep the project moving, that's why they have come forward now.

Ms. Flagler stated that's correct.

On motion of Alderman Greazzo, duly seconded by Alderman Gamache, it was voted to approve this item.

Chairman Roy addressed item 18 of the agenda:

18. [Discussion relative to the Neighborhood Stabilization Program.](#)

Chairman Roy stated I believe you have some information for us, Mr. LaFreniere.

Mr. Leon LaFreniere, Planning and Community Development Director, stated I do. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have a couple of items that I'd like to bring to the committee's attention under item 18, and then I would request respectfully the opportunity to go into executive session to talk about property acquisitions. I would also point out to the committee that item 19 under tabled items is ready to act on this evening if you choose to act on that before we go into executive session. The items this evening that we have to talk about under the Neighborhood Stabilization Program: 65 Massabesic Street has been a property that we have been working with for some time. We had received authorization from the committee and the board to pursue acquisition of this property. It regenerated a requirement because of the funding source that we go through a state historic review procedure and that took quite a bit of time. And also we had some impact on what the ultimate costs will be for acquisition. Since we underwent this process, our purchase and sale agreement on the property has expired, and I felt it was appropriate to bring this forward to the committee to consider whether you wish to move forward on the property again and attempt to renew the purchase and sale agreement and acquire the property.

Chairman Roy asked and this is NSP funds?

Mr. LaFreniere replied yes.

Chairman Roy stated so we've given you permission to buy the property already and you're giving us this update.

Mr. LaFreniere replied that is correct. The property was under agreement to purchase for a purchase price of \$74,250 and we would certainly look to enter into an agreement for a similar amount. I say similar because I believe that enough time has elapsed where we need to renew our appraisal. Under the terms of the program we can only pay up to the appraised value of the property, so I have to make sure that the property still appraises out for that value. The property, for the board's purposes just to refresh memories and identify it for those who weren't involved earlier on, on the second page is the triangle in yellow under the environs 65 Massabesic Street title page, identified where the property is, It is adjacent to the property that is in bold black that we currently own and purchased with NSP funds, that was the former Oven Poppers and Sealtest Ice Cream plant that was in dilapidated condition. We have since torn that property down and that lot is being land-banked for open space and potential future use. The next couple of pages are a copy of a communication that we received regarding the historic review. This required us to go before our local heritage commission and in an effort to satisfy the terms of the state historic review, we had to identify what the costs would be and those are on the first page. The next pages, again, to refresh memories, this is the front of the property in question, 65 Massabesic Street. There is a picture of the side of the property, and as you can see, it is in significantly deteriorated condition and I feel it would be still an important property for us to acquire and remove because of its dilapidated condition and because of its proximity to the previously acquired property at 401 Spruce Street. The total cost I have estimated on the cover sheet will come up to in the vicinity of a high-end of \$161,500. I'm hoping that we can reduce some of those costs, but wherever I had a price range associated with a cost of an acquisition and demolition, I put the higher in there so we could see what the outside limits would be.

Chairman Roy stated thank you.

Alderman Greazzo stated thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. LaFreniere, can you give us a little breakdown as to the estimated cost of historical review conditions? If you're going to tear this down, why are you getting a historical review?

Mr. LaFreniere replied a condition of the historic review was that we do an area survey. So we would have to hire a historic preservation consultant to do a survey and analysis of the neighborhood, document the historic features of the environs that need to be cataloged and identified, and there were other additional costs associated with putting up a historic plaque and restrictions on how the property might be used in the future. The primary costs being the cost to hire a consultant and that is on the high end we feel it could be up to \$18,000.

Alderman Greazzo asked is that a requirement under the use of the funds for this project to be able to have that reviewed?

Mr. LaFreniere replied yes, it is.

Alderman Greazzo stated okay, thank you. Could you explain the relocation cost? What are we relocating?

Mr. LaFreniere replied the relocation costs are associated with this are that the building is currently occupied. It is a two-unit building and we would have to relocate the existing tenants.

Alderman Greazzo stated thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you, Mr. LaFreniere.

Mr. LaFreniere stated I would just ask if the board still wishes us to pursue that and if they do, I believe that we have all of the pieces in place to execute this agreement.

Chairman Roy asked you're looking for a motion for us to say we want you to pursue it?

Mr. LaFreniere replied that would be appreciated, yes.

On motion of Alderman Shea, duly seconded by Alderman Gamache, it was voted to pursue the acquisition of 65 Massabesic Street.

Mr. LaFreniere stated I have an additional subject matter for public session. I wanted to provide a very brief status update for 434 Lake Avenue, the Odd Fellows building. We have, as the committee is aware, been under construction for some time. Construction is nearing completion, the property has come out, I think, extremely well. The final certificate of occupancy was issued last week, the contractor is still onsite with taking care of punch list items and final finish details. MCRC has moved into the property and has started operations, and with regard to the rest of the lease bases, I do have our first tenant in addition to MCRC that I would like to sign a lease with. This organization is ORIS, who would occupy the second floor. ORIS is the Organization for Refugee and Immigrant Success. They have been one of our partners since the beginning that we've identified this agency for the committee as one of the groups that were interested in having partnered with us and occupy the building. And we have completed a draft lease agreement that has been reviewed by the solicitor, and I would look for authorization to move forward with executing that lease with this agency.

Chairman Roy stated thank you.

On motion of Alderman Greazzo, duly seconded by Alderman Shea, it was voted that the Planning and Community Development Director execute the lease agreement with ORIS for the property at 434 Lake Avenue.

Mr. LaFreniere stated if it would be possible, on the ORIS lease to report that out tonight, that would be appreciated because they are effectively homeless right now and we're trying to get them in the building.

Chairman Roy stated please report this out tonight.

Mr. LaFreniere stated I have a copy for the clerk.

TABLED ITEMS

19. [Communication from Leon LaFreniere, Planning and Community Development Director, requesting the subordination of a City lien totaling \\$11,816 on the property at 30 Fairmount Avenue.](#)
[\(Note: Tabled 3/4/2013; additional documentation to from the Planning Department is attached\)](#)

On motion of Alderman Greazzo, duly seconded by Alderman Shea, it was voted to remove this item from the table.

Chairman Roy stated Leon, I've talked to you about this. We're going to be in the same position, the person is getting no money out, and in reality they only owe about \$2,400. They've brought that \$11,816 down by annual payments. Is that correct?

Mr. LaFreniere responded that is correct, and the only reason it was placed on the table was because the city solicitor had not had the opportunity to review the subordination documents at your last meeting. They have done that.

Chairman Roy asked the solicitor has reviewed those?

Mr. Thomas Arnold, Deputy City Solicitor, replied yes. As you can see on page 19.8.

On motion of Alderman Greazzo, duly seconded by Alderman Gamache, it was voted to approve this item.

Alderman Craig stated just one quick item before we go into non-public. In looking through the mayor's CIP budget, and I sat through many of the meetings, it's hard to determine what the other requests are. So I'm wondering if your department could put together, in the same format that we received, the entities that made requests as well as what the requests were so that we can assess what we have in front of us. I don't know if what we've allocated within this budget for these entities is what they asked for too. That would helpful. Thank you.

Mr. LaFreniere replied certainly.

On motion of Alderman Shea, duly seconded by Alderman Gamache, on unanimous roll call it was voted to enter into non-public session pursuant to RSA 91-A:3, II(d) for consideration of property aquisition.

Chairman Roy called the meeting back to order.

*On motion of **Alderman Shea**, duly seconded by **Alderman Greazzo**, it was voted to seal the minutes of the non-public session.*

*On motion of **Alderman Shea**, duly seconded by **Alderman Craig**, it was voted that the Planning & Community Development Director be authorized to enter into a Purchase and Sale Agreement for a price up to the appraised value of the property discussed in non-public session.*

*There being no further business, on motion of **Alderman Shea**, duly seconded by **Alderman Gamache**, it was voted to adjourn.*

A True Record. Attest.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Matthew Normand". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke at the end.

Clerk of Committee